



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/517,383

06/27/2005

Ulrik Darling Larsen

ALB.018

5689

20987 7590 02/03/2009
VOLENTINE & WHITT PLLC
ONE FREEDOM SQUARE
11951 FREEDOM DRIVE SUITE 1260
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

FRITCHMAN, REBECCA M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1797

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/03/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/517,383 | Applicant(s) LARSEN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner REBECCA FRITCHMAN | Art Unit 1797 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) REBECCA FRITCHMAN. (3) Andrew Telesy.

(2) Jill Warden (SPE). (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 27 January 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 22-46.

Identification of prior art discussed: Oberhardt, Stave.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed the references indicating that none are chips containing a chamber having a lysing agent. Applicant also pointed out that none of the references teach a dual flow embodiment as claimed in claim 35. An agreement was reached to drop the existing rejection in Office Action dated 08/19/2008 and update the existing search upon submission of applicant's response.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

| | |
|--|---|
| | /Jill Warden/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797 |
|--|---|